

REMARKS

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Office Action dated February 23, 2006, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on May 23, 2006. Please reconsider the claims pending in the application for reasons discussed below.

In the specification, paragraphs [0014], [0026], [0028], [0029], [0032] and [0048] have been amended to correct minor editorial matters.

Claims 1-10 and 36-45 remain pending in the application and are shown above. Claims 11-35 have been canceled by Applicants as directed to non-elected subject matter. Applicants reserve the right to prosecute the claims in a divisional application. Claims 1-10 and 36 stand rejected by the Examiner. Reconsideration of the rejected claims is requested for reasons presented below.

Claims 1-10 and 36 are amended to clarify the invention. New claims 37-45 have been added. Claims 1 and 36 have been amended to require a cartridge comprising a porous material disposed in a fluid path defined in the cartridge. Support for the amendments can be found at least at paragraphs [0030] and [0035], Figure 3 and in originally filed claims 3-10. These amendments are not presented to distinguish a reference, thus, the claims as amended are entitled to a full range of equivalents if not previously amended to distinguish a reference.

Claims 1-4, 6 and 36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by US 3,820,557 to *Wartman*. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Wartman does not disclose a cartridge that comprises a porous material disposed in a fluid path defined in the cartridge because *Wartman* is directed to a fire extinguisher. A porous material disposed in a fluid path defined in the cartridge will "reduce water flow rate" through the cartridge "and lower output pressure at the nozzle" by increasing the drag through the cartridge which "can be disastrous in a fire fighting situation." (See *Wartman* at column 6, lines 44-58). Therefore, *Wartman*, alone or in combination, does not teach, show, or suggest a cartridge that comprises a porous material disposed in a fluid path defined in the cartridge, as recited in claims 1 and 36, and claims dependent thereon. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Applicants further traverse the rejection of dependent claims 2-4 and 6 on grounds that they depend from claim 1, which is believed to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 5-7, 9 and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 3,820,557 to *Wartman*. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Wartman does not disclose a cartridge that comprises a porous material disposed in a fluid path defined in the cartridge because *Wartman* is directed to a fire extinguisher. A porous material disposed in a fluid path defined in the cartridge will “reduce water flow rate” through the cartridge “and lower output pressure at the nozzle” by increasing the drag through the cartridge which “can be disastrous in a fire fighting situation” (see *Wartman* at column 6, lines 55-58). Therefore, *Wartman*, alone or in combination, does not teach, show, or suggest a cartridge that comprises a porous material disposed in a fluid path defined in the cartridge, as required in claims 5-7, 9 and 10. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-10 and 36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 5,997,712 to *Ting et al. (Ting)* in view of US 3,820,557 to *Wartman*. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Ting and *Wartman* do not disclose a cartridge comprising a porous material disposed in a fluid path defined in the cartridge. By replacing the cartridge of *Ting* with the dissolver of *Wartman*, as the Examiner suggests, the dissolver would not have a porous material disposed in a fluid path defined in the cartridge. *Wartman* coats the surface of the dissolver with the replenishment agent. The replenishment agent dissolves as the fluid flows over the agent. There is no powder reagent that could uncontrollably pass through the dissolver. Without any powder reagent, there is no need for a porous material disposed in a fluid path defined in the dissolver. Therefore, *Ting* and *Wartman*, alone or in combination, do not teach, show, or suggest a cartridge comprising a porous material disposed in a fluid path defined in the cartridge, as recited in claims 1 and 36, and claims dependent thereon. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Applicants further traverse the rejection of dependent claims 2-10 on grounds that they depend from claim 1, which is believed to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

In conclusion, the references cited by the Examiner, alone or in combination, do not teach, show, or suggest the invention as claimed.

Having addressed all issues set out in the office action, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the claims be allowed.

Respectfully submitted,



B. Todd Patterson
Registration No. 37,906
PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.
3040 Post Oak Blvd. Suite 1500
Houston, TX 77056
Telephone: (713) 623-4844
Facsimile: (713) 623-4846
Attorney for Applicants